[c] 7. The fifteen parts (of the individual self) go to their causes, and the senses to their corresponding deities.
The deeds and the Self consisting in understanding,—all become one with the highest, undecaying one.

[tc] 8. As flowing rivers are absorbed in the sea, giving up their names and forms, so the wise man freed from name
and form, enters the Divine Person who is higher than the
high."

This verse indicates the exact nature of the identification
of the knower with Brahman. It declares that the individual
on having attained the knowledge of God loses his separate
individuality and is merged into God. This, of course, is the
well-known monistic theory which was fully developed by Sankara
in later times.

I quote below Tattwabhushan's interpretation of this verse:—

"The figure is likely to mislead ; but it is only a figure ani must
not be strained. When once the inward change that com.^3 with
enlightenment becomes familiar to the mind, the figure itself does not
soem to be an inapt one. The enlightened soulfeelsthat it is not different
from the Infinite but one with it,—that names and forms are unreal
when looked at from the divine standpoint, that individuality does not
really separate us, as it seems to do from the universal,—that the
Divine Being is all-in-all. This consciousness of unity with God
as a spiritual fact could scarcely be expressed by a bstter figure than
that of the ocean as comprehending all waters in its all-embracing

unity. The conscious subsumption of individual existence in the universal, the renunciation of egotism, is not inaptly represented by the flowing of the river into the sea. The individual mind, so long as it thinks itself different from the Universal, so long as it is bound by banks of egotistic ignorance, is like a river bound by steep banks on both sides. When the finite feels itself to be one with the Infinite. feels that the same undivided consciousness is universal in one aspect and individual in another, it becomes like a river mixing its water with the water of the sea. That the writer who used this figure did not contemplate the annihilation of individuality seems clear also from the *mantva* that follows. If annihilation had been what he intended to teach, he should have stopped at the *mantva* just quoted ; for, what more can possibly be said of one who as an individual, has